



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

His suggestion of the possibility of a connection of the Kaṇva family with the Aryan tribe assumed, on the basis of the inscriptions found at Boghazkeui, to have been located in Armenia in the 15th century B.C. is very hazardous. As yet the Boghazkeui evidence means nothing for the interpretation of the Rig Veda. The transcription of the names themselves is still uncertain and even if the transcription be correct the names may not be Aryan. We know as yet too little of the Hittite and Mittanian languages and name elements. The words may contain perfectly good Hittite or Mittanian elements. Only when we know the Hittite and Mittanian languages thoroughly will we have the right to be dogmatic. Altogether too much has been built on a very weak foundation by Semitic scholars. The names have not yet been subjected to any rigorous philological criticism. Hillebrandt might have referred to at least a few of the many contradictory articles in which the Boghazkeui and the Tell el-Amarna names have been discussed.

In his treatment of the so-called Ākhyāna or dialogue hymns Hillebrandt follows a weakly conciliatory method. Some hymns he treats as dramas, others as dialogues with omitted prose. In spite of the articles of Oldenberg, von Schroeder, Winternitz, Sieg, and Hertel I am unconvinced of the validity of either theory. It seems to me that we have in these hymns, not a prototype of the drama or of the mixed style in prose and verse found later in the Jātakas and the Pañcatantra but a prototype of the epic. They may be rude ballads. They require nothing but a detailed knowledge of the story to make them perfectly intelligible.

Here too as in his *Vedische Mythologie* Hillebrandt assigns to the moon too great a place in Vedic mythology. Varuṇa, Bṛhaspati, Apām Napāt, and Soma are all to be connected with a moon ritual. It may be so, but too little reserve is shown in the statement of his own theory.

WALTER E. CLARK

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE DOCTRINE OF PENANCE

The study of the origins of penance is fundamental in the study of the church, whether that be considered divinely founded or as the creation of man in the effort to satisfy his highest need. Closely involved with this study are a number of other important questions, such as the standards of conduct of the Christian group, the enforcement of these standards, authority in the group, the development of the clergy as a ruling class, the growth of the power of the keys—in fact, the very

essence of the character of the Christian group. But the point of view just sketched is not that which has governed the study of the subject up to the present time, nor has it been held by Professor D'Ales in the work now under discussion.<sup>1</sup> He, as well as previous writers, has not viewed the subject in its most general bearings. The church has been regarded as divinely founded rather than as a product of social evolution, subject to laws which govern all social change. The institution of penance is looked on as forming a part of a divine, foreordained scheme rather than as a result of group effort to preserve its integrity in the midst of a hostile social environment. The result has been the study of the subject from a somewhat too narrow point of view. The Catholics have been concerned with showing the existence of its characteristic features in primitive Christianity, the Protestants with demonstrating their absence and accounting for their development later. Yet both sets of scholars employ the historical method and their results tend increasingly to approximate each other.

The common position accepted by both Protestants and Catholics up to the time of D'Ales is somewhat as follows: Up to the time of Callistus the three chief sins were held to be unforgivable; Callistus was the first to bring about a moderation of this severity by absolving the faults of the flesh; thirty years later Pope Cornelius took a new step in the way of indulgence by reconciling the apostates guilty of having sacrificed to idols during the Decian persecution; finally, at an epoch difficult to define, but still later, homicide was in its turn erased from the list of unforgivable sins. Hence the moderation of primitive rigor followed a regular progression. To Callistus belongs a preponderant part in this change, since in daring first of all to absolve those guilty of immorality, he opened the breach by which all the later ameliorations passed. By the Protestants this change is explained by a preceding change in dogma, namely, the development of the keys theory. This theory gradually dawned on the consciousness of the hierarchy and led it to claim the power of forgiving sins committed after baptism. Such a development the Catholics deny. They claim that the church had always had knowledge of unlimited power to forgive sins conferred on it by Christ, but that for reasons of prudence it believed it necessary to refrain from the exercise of this power until in the course of the third century certain conditions arose which led it to depart from its ancient reserve.

<sup>1</sup> *L'Édit de Calliste. Étude sur les origines de la pénitence chrétienne (Bibliothèque de théologie historique, publiée sous la direction des professeurs de théologie à l'Institut Catholique de Paris)*. By A. D'Ales. Paris: G. Beauchesne, 1913. vi+484 pages.

Into this subject D'Ales was led, as he himself states in his introduction, by two previous studies in the same field. These were: *La théologie de Tertullien*, 1905, and *La théologie de Saint Hippolyte*, 1906. During this work there seems gradually to have formed in his mind the notion that the interpretations of the edict of Callistus were not in harmony with the laws of social development. These interpretations implied a much more abrupt and sudden change in institutions than can ordinarily be made by any piece of legislation. To the development of his ideas on this subject a particular relation seems to have been held by certain conclusions to which his work on Tertullian pointed. These conclusions were: (1) that the notion of sin unforgivable by the church (idolatry, homicide, adultery) is not to be found in the writings of Tertullian before he turns Montanist; (2) on the contrary, they represent Montanist thought, and appear in the *De pudicitia* for the first time; (3) that here, too, first appears the idea that there is a distinction between reconciliation with the church and with God; (4) that Tertullian denies to the hierarchy wholly authority over all sins, believing in the Holy Spirit, speaking through prophets as the authority in the church, and in the church as an "assembly of saints." In the light of these conclusions, Tertullian rather than Callistus began to appear as the innovator. Hence came an impulse to verify these suggestions by reviewing the whole development of penance up to this point. The general problem lay in his mind as follows: Did the initiative, taken about 220 by Pope Callistus, on the subject of penitential discipline have the character of a profound revolution, or was it an incident of only moderate consequence, which owes to the notice of certain polemicists a place in the record much superior to the influence which it exerted?

By this problem and these suggestions the general nature of D'Ales' contentions and conclusions are already foreshadowed. In the first place, he is led to conclude that the edict appears to him, not as an extraordinary outburst of Christian vigor, but rather as a shoot hardly more perceptible than many another in the perpetual flow of life that mounts in the secular trunk of the church. The whole position, of which the exaggerated importance of the edict formed a part, appears to him false. The notion of unforgivable sins, upon which this structure rests, he cannot find in the record. On the contrary, he is convinced that "Christian tradition deposes with a perfect clearness in favor of pardon offered by God for all sins without exception, whatever might be their number and gravity." Furthermore, contrary to the Protestant position, he finds that "the Church has always claimed the superintendence of this pardon." In other words, the power of the keys is not a

dogma gradually evolved and, toward the end of the second century, put forward by the hierarchy. In opposition to other Catholic scholars, D'Ales alleges that not only does the church claim this right to exercise the power of the keys, but she actually exercised it in the two centuries preceding the pontificate of Callistus.

These contentions are the fruits, in the first place, of the author's knowledge of Tertullian's work and that of Hippolytus. From these men he extracts evidence that throws light on the second century. This light he adds to by gleaning from the second-century writers themselves evidence that bears on the question. His analysis of *Hermas* is worth a special mention. It was *Hermas*' purpose, D'Ales concludes, to write a pastoral guide, and his passages on penance are to be explained by this purpose; *Hermas*, D'Ales holds, is not self-contradictory, nor does he reveal the presence of two opposed parties, but as a pastor he has a different teaching for different groups of Christians. He varies his teaching to secure the maximum effect. To the catechumens he says: no forgiveness for sins after baptism; to baptized Christians who have sinned: you can be forgiven now, if penitent, but never again. This same method, D'Ales claimed, is followed in similar works by Justin and by other Christian fathers.

By a synthesis of his various contentions and conclusions D'Ales' constructive position can be discerned and may be stated as follows: The church was an assembly of holy ones, struggling toward perfection, but all members were having slips of some kind and many were having rather bad ones. These slips in the case of the baptized ones were met by the exercise of pardon to all who were willing to do penance. This pardon was signified by reconciliation with the church. The machinery of this operation does not appear during the first and second centuries with any clearness, yet the action of the clergy in the matter is implicit in ecclesiastical reconciliation. Up to the time of Callistus the policy of the church in relation to the three gravest classes of sins wavered. The general principles of the possibility of pardon for all sins and the power of the church to pardon were held fast, yet the conservative and liberal elements, universally present in all human assemblies, differed as to the use of this power. The frequency of sins of immorality, combined with the difficulty of refusing pardon to the genuine penitent, worked in favor of the more liberal party. The evidence points to a fairly widespread practice, current during the second century, of granting reconciliation to the gravest sinners, though perhaps not until at the point of death. The gradual growth of this tendency is marked by

the whole action of Callistus, of which his edict is only a part. The effect of the edict was in the nature of giving the force of written law to what was a steadily developing custom. The same may be said of the final decisions, taken in the middle of the third century in regard to the *lapsed*. They involved no new principle, but resulted in a more definite and controlling statement of policy. As one passes into the fourth century the policy of the church becomes defined with increasing clearness and appears as steadily inclined to greater and greater moderation in its demands of penance from the sinner. In the third century also the ministration of the clergy comes definitely into the light, as does also the practice of private confession, viewed by the author as an integral part of the whole institutional development.

As for the significance of D'Ales' work, it clearly must be reckoned with in any thoroughgoing study of the subject, for it takes its place along with the studies of Harnack, Funck, and others. Rich in suggestion, it brings out more clearly the actual character of the evolution of the institution than has heretofore been done. It is chiefly to be criticized for the atmosphere in which the whole study has been made. This is still largely the old sectarian one which devotes itself to trying to find out whether penance was instituted by Christ and to what extent it is to be found in primitive Christianity. There is no question of considering the institution in the light of general social phenomena, that is, as a feature of group life and as discharging special functions in that connection.

CURTIS H. WALKER

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

### THE REFORMATION IN GERMANY<sup>1</sup>

In a brief foreword the author seeks to justify this new attempt to retell an oft-told story. The chief justification he finds in the fact that the economic interpretation of history has not, hitherto, been applied to this period; that hence the story has been told inadequately. The main purpose of this volume is, therefore, to present an economic interpretation of the German Reformation. Further justification the author finds "in the modern scientific method of studying history, with its emphasis on original research, its multiplication of documents, . . . its flood of monographs," which "tends to issue in mean and sordid collection of mere fact and to make the writing of history a lost art." He believes

<sup>1</sup> *The Reformation in Germany*. By Henry C. Vedder. New York: Macmillan, 1914. xlix+466 pages.